

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO		
10/618,132	07/11/2003		Ming Che Wu	62188.011200	4425		
32361	7590	04/12/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER		
GREENBER 885 3RD AVI		G, LLP		MAI, HU	MAI, HUY KIM		
NEW YORK,				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
				2873	-		

DATE MAILED: 04/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	1/
	10/618,132	WU, MING CHE	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Huy K. Mai	2873	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence address -	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may eply within the statutory minimum of t od will apply and will expire SIX (6) Mo ute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed nirty (30) days will be considered timely. DNTHS from the mailing date of this communica ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ation.
Status			
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11	July 2003		
	nis action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	vance except for formal ma	-	s is
Disposition of Claims			
4)	rawn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.		
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ ad	ccepted or b)  objected t	by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		, ,	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the			. ,
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in iority documents have bee eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)	_		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) o(s)/Mail Date	
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date		Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### Oath/Declaration

1. The declaration filed on Nov. 20, 2003 is acceptable.

# Specification

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The specification lacks of the summary of the invention.

Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Objections

3. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: The phrase "the at least rib" (claim 1, line 11) should read –the at least one rib--. Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1 and 4-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chao (6,264,323).

Regarding claims 1, 4-7, Chao discloses in Figs. 5-7, column 3, lines 21-40, an eyeglass assembly comprising a pair of first eyeglasses 50 and a pair of second eyeglasses 50', a retainer integrally formed with the first bridge 51 and consisting of an upper clamping plate 53, a lower clamping plate 54 and a space defined between the upper and lower clamping plates. However

Application/Control Number: 10/618,132

Art Unit: 2873

the combination of at least one positioning rib 57 and at least one groove 58 are formed on the inner face of the lower clamping plate and the second bridge, respectively, instead of the at least one rib formed on the second bridge and the at least one groove formed on the inner face of the lower clamping plate as claimed in claim 1. Thus the differences between the claimed invention over the Chao reference are merely the interchanged positions of the rib and groove formed on either the inner face of the lower clamping plate or the second bridge. Such interchanged positions of the rib and groove would have been easily motivated to a person having ordinary skill in this art to modify the position of the rib and groove by forming the rib on the second bridge and forming the groove on the inner face of the lower clamping plate. Such a modification would not change the scope of the retainer to combine the first pair of eyeglasses to a second pair of eyeglasses. In another word, the limitations in claim 1 are unpatentable over Chao reference under 35 USC 103.

Further the quotation states "Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made." The difference of the position of the rib and groove in claimed invention is merely negatived by the manner in which the invention made by Chao reference. Thus, the claimed invention in claim 1 is unpatentably distinct from the Chao reference as stated in the 103 quotations.

Regarding claim 8, the limitations in claim 8 are similar to those of claim 1, except for the retainer is integrally formed with the first bridge instead of the retainer detachably connected to the first bridge and the second bridge as claimed. Chao also discloses in Fig. 12, his retainer 913 including the upper and clamping plates 916, 917 detachably connected to the first bridge 911 and the second bridge 911. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan to modify the

Art Unit: 2873

above-discussed Chao's modified retainer in light of Chao's teachings by forming the retainer separately from the first bridge where the retainer detachably connected to the first bridge and

the second bridge to combine the first pair of eyeglasses and the second pair of eyeglasses as the

same purpose as the applicant does.

6. Claims 2,3 and 9-11 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chao as

applied to claims 1,4-8 above, and further in view of Wang (5,335,025).

The claimed invention in claims 2,3,9-11 is taught by Chao as discussed above, except for the

upper and lower clamping plates including inclined faces and the bridges including the truncated

corners as claimed. Such the inclined faces and the truncated corners are for facilitating to

combine the retainer to the bridges. The inclined faces and the truncated corners are for

facilitating to combine a first element to a second element are commonly knowledge in the art as

taught by Wang, for example. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan to truncate the

corners of the bridge and to incline the inner surface of the upper and lower clamping plates of

the Chao reference as commonly knowledge in the art for facilitating to combine the retainer to

the bridges as the same as the applicant does.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Huy Mai whose telephone number is (571) 272-2334. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00 a.m.-4:30 p.m.).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Georgia Y. Epps can be reached on (571) 272-2328. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 2873

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1562.

Huy Mai

Primary Examiner Art Unit 2873

HKM/

April 5, 2004